

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

Claim 2 is currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 4, 6-8 and 11-14 are currently being amended.

Claims 16-18 are currently being added.

This amendment adds, cancels and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding, canceling and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1 and 3-18 are now pending in this application.

Objection to the Drawings:

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to, for the reasons set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. By way of this amendment and reply, the pads 20 and 21 in Figure 1 have been identified in the specification, and the “paintbrush form-factor” feature in claim 7 has been deleted from that claim. Accordingly, the drawings are believed to be unobjectionable, without amendment.

Objection to the Specification:

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to because of informalities noted on pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action. By way of this amendment and reply, the specification has been amended to correct those minor informalities.

Objection to the Claims:

In the Office Action, claims 4, 8-10 and 14 were objected to because of informalities noted on page 4 of the Office Action. By way of this amendment and reply, those claims have been amended to correct the minor informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph:

In the Office Action, claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on page 4 of the Office Action. Due to the amendments made to claim 11, this rejection has been overcome.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,312,124 to Desormeaux; claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desormeaux in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,355,303 to Ferla et al.; and claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Desormeaux in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,878,200 to Ichimura. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of independent claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Desormeaux discloses or suggests all of the features recited in that claim. In reply, presently pending independent claim 1 now recites that the hybrid printing device has a computer mouse form-factor. See, for example, Figures 1 and 2 of the drawings. In contrast, Desormeaux's printing apparatus 60 does not correspond to a computer mouse in shape or size or function.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Desormeaux.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 12, the Office Action asserts that Desormeaux discloses or suggests all of the features recited in that claim. In reply, presently pending independent claim 12 now recites:

*A method of printing on a surface, the method comprising the steps of:
printing, with a handheld hybrid printing device, an indicia pattern on the surface prior to printing an actual printing pattern on the surface with the handheld hybrid printing device;*

detecting the absolute position of a printing means housed within the handheld hybrid printing device in relation to the surface by detection of portions of the indicia pattern situated directly beneath the handheld hybrid printing device, and activating the printing

means at designated locations on the surface as a function of the detected position on that surface, to thereby print the actual printing pattern on the surface.

While column 7, lines 18-23 of Desormeaux describes that a strip of tape carrying regularly spaced markings or other indicia may be placed on the print surface to lie under the sensor 120 during the print stroke, it is clear from the disclosure of Desormeaux that the tape is printed onto a user's skin surface by the printing device of Desormeaux.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 12 is not anticipated by Desormeaux.

New Claims:

New claims 16-18 have been added to recite features of use of information stored in the indicia in order to determine particular print characteristics, whereby such features are believed to provide an additional basis of patentability for those claims, beyond the reasons given above for their respective base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 14, 2007

By Philip J. Articola

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Customer No.: 22879
Telephone: (202) 672-5485
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819